

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-21. The Examiner has objected to claims 6, 10, 22, and 23, but states that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 18. Applicant has added new claims 24-27. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-27.

The Examiner has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,767). Regarding claim 18, Applicant has amended claim 18. Applicant submits that Sakamoto fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 18. For example, Sakamoto fails to disclose the step of "using routing information included in the egress data to determine to which among the following group the egress data is provided: the first line card, the second line card, and both the first and the second line cards." In fact, Sakamoto teaches away from such subject matter. For example, in column 2, lines 20-23, as cited by the Examiner, Sakamoto states that an input cell is routed to an ATM switch 2 output according to the contents of the cell header thereof and then states that the output cell is sent via the selector card 3 to be broadcast to line interface cards of the active and standby systems corresponding to the output port. Thus, Sakamoto appears to teach that, while contents of the cell header are used for routing an input cell to an output of ATM switch 2, communication of the output cell is not dependent on the same contents of the cell header, as Sakamoto does not appear to provide the ability to selectively route the output cell to line interface cards, but merely broadcasts the output cell to both the line interface cards of the active and standby systems. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 18, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,767). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As to claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1. Applicant also reiterates Applicant's previous arguments for the allowability of claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 15, Applicant has amended claim 15. Applicant also reiterates Applicant's previous arguments for the allowability of claim 15. Applicant submits that claim 15, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 2 and 3, Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claims 2 and 3 depend. Furthermore, Applicant reiterates Applicant's previous arguments for the allowability of claims 2 and 3. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 3 are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 16, Applicant has amended claim 15, from which claim 16 depends. Furthermore, Applicant reiterates Applicant's previous arguments for the allowability of claim 16. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 4 and 17, Applicant has amended claim 17. Applicant has also amended claims 1 and 15, from which claims 4 and 17 depend. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 17 are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 5, Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 7 and 9, the Examiner states that "Sakamoto does not explicitly disclose that the system comprises filters" and further that "one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that Sakamoto's system inherently comprises filters for filtering selected data and discarding other data." However, the Examiner does not cite any evidence, either in any portion of Sakamoto or in any other prior art reference, to support that assertion. Thus, Applicant submits that there is no reasonable basis for such an assertion. Moreover, Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claims 7 and 9 depend. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 7 and 9 are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 8, the Examiner states that Sakamoto implies that selector control register 27 determines selected data types. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Sakamoto states, in col. 8, lines 9-13, as cited by the Examiner, that "selector card 3 includes a selector for selecting either one of the streams of input cells received via the paired line interface circuits 15...[and] a selector control register 27 for outputting a selection signal of the selector 9." The Examiner has already admitted that Sakamoto does not explicitly disclose that the system comprises filters. As such, Sakamoto also does not disclose "wherein filters are configured based on a register that determines the selected data types." Moreover, selector control register 27 is not a "register that determines the selected data types," as it does not determine selected data types, but merely outputs a selection signal of the selector 9, and selector 9 selects either one of the streams of input cells received via the paired line interface circuits

15, not data types. Moreover, Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claim 8 depends. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 11, Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claim 11 depends. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 12-14, Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claims 12-14 depend. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 12-14 are in condition for allowance.

As to claims 19-21, Applicant has amended claim 18, from which claims 19-21 depend. Furthermore, Applicant reiterates Applicant's previous arguments for the allowability of claims 19-21. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 19-21 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to claims 6, 10, 22 and 23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but states that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As to claims 6 and 10, Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claims 6 and 10 depend. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 6 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Moreover, Applicant has added new claims 26 and 27 derived from objected to claims 6 and 10. Thus, Applicant submits that new claims 26 and 27 are in condition for allowance.

As to claims 22 and 23, Applicant has amended claim 18, from which claims 22 and 23 depend. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 22 and 23 are in condition for allowance. Moreover, Applicant has added new claims 24 and 25 derived from objected to claims 22 and 23. Thus, Applicant submits that new claims 24 and 25 are also in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

09/09/2003

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.
115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 347-9223 (phone)
(512) 347-9224 (fax)